

Circuit Court for Prince George's County
Case No.: CAD06-26267

UNREPORTED
IN THE APPELLATE COURT
OF MARYLAND

No. 928

September Term, 2024

STARSHA M. SEWELL

v.

JOHN B. HOWARD

Graeff,
Kehoe, S.,
Sharer, J. Frederick
(Senior Judge, Specially Assigned),

JJ.

PER CURIAM

Filed: May 14, 2025

*This is a per curiam opinion. Under Rule 1-104, the opinion is not precedent within the rule of stare decisis, nor may it be cited as persuasive authority.

Starsha M. Sewell, appellant, appeals from an order of the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County denying her motion to reconsider the denial of her motion to vacate a 2014 custody order and all directives issued by the court to enforce that order. Sewell claims that the circuit court lacked jurisdiction to enter the custody order and that various parties involved in her case had engaged in fraudulent or discriminatory activity. She has raised this issue before.

We first rejected Sewell’s argument in 2018, holding that the circuit court had jurisdiction to enter the 2014 custody order and that Sewell had failed to demonstrate the existence of any fraud, mistake, or irregularity that would have warranted the court vacating that judgment. *See Sewell v. Howard*, No. 2266, Sept. Term, 2017 (filed Aug. 31, 2018). Since then, Sewell has continued to file motions in the circuit court raising largely the same arguments and seeking the same relief. She appealed from the denial of some of those motions, and every time, we affirmed, finding that her claims are barred by the law of the case doctrine. *See generally Sewell v. Howard*, No. 2012, Sept. Term, 2022, slip op. at 1–2 (filed June 20, 2023) (cataloguing Sewell’s barred appeals). So too here.

Sewell again claims the circuit court lacked jurisdiction to enter the custody order and that she was fraudulently deprived of her federal civil rights and substantial due process. We have previously addressed these contentions on appeal and held that they lack merit. Consequently, Sewell’s claims are barred by the law of the case doctrine. *See Baltimore Cnty. v. Baltimore Cnty. Fraternal Ord. of Police, Lodge No. 4*, 220 Md. App. 596, 659 (2014) (noting that “neither the questions decided [by the appellate courts] nor

the ones that could have been raised and decided are available to be raised in a subsequent appeal” (cleaned up)).

**JUDGMENT OF THE CIRCUIT
COURT FOR PRINCE GEORGE’S
COUNTY AFFIRMED. COSTS TO
BE PAID BY APPELLANT.**